DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 470 SO 021 140

AUTHOR Nelson, Lynn R.; Drake, Frderick D.
TITLE Recent History of the Social Studies, 1945-1985: The Teachers' Perspective.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Anaheim, CA, November 16-22, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Educational History; Educational Research; High Schools; Literature Reviews; *Oral History; *Social Studies; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching (Occupation); *Teaching Experience; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Most research concerning the history of social studies education in the United States has focused on curriculum reform movements centered at universities. This oral history study, however, seeks to provide a history of the social studies from the perspective of the classroom teacher. The paper focuses on the curricular and instructional decisions made by high school social studies teachers in the four decades following the end of the Second World War. A review of the literature on social studies education and analysis of approximately 30 oral history interviews with high school teachers comprise the report. A 27-item reference list is included. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329470

Recent History of the Social Studies, 1945-1985:

The Teachers' Perspectives

Lynn R. Nelson

College of Education

University of Maine

Orono, Maine

Frederick D. Drake

Department of History

Illinois State University

Normal, Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

FREDERICK D. DRAKE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the 1990 Meeting of the National Council

For The Social Studies, College & University Faculty Assembly,

Anaheim, California

SO 021 140

Introduction

Research concerning the history of social studies education in the United States has focused on curriculum reform movements centered in universities. Hertzberg, in Social Studies Reform, 1880-1980 (1981), documented efforts of university social studies educators and created a history of social studies education from the perspective of "change agents." Hertzberg's seminal writing and the works of Cuban (1984) and ethnographer McNeil (1988) prompted our study; for while these social studies theorists provided important assessments, they have not provided a complete picture of what social studies teachers actually did in the classroom nor how social studies practitioners reacted to and implemented suggested curriculum reforms. It is these concerns that led to our oral history study which we have entitled, "Recent History of the Social Studies, 1945-1985: The Teachers' Perspectives."

The purpose of our study is to write a history of the social studies from the perspective of the classroom teacher. The focus of this paper is to report preliminary findings of the curricular and instructional decisions made by high school social studies teachers in the four decades following the end of the Second World War. Although we envision expanding our research to encompass and include elementary, middle school, and high school teachers from a national perspective, our paper reports an in-progress, impressionistic study of high school teachers in the states Maine and Illinois. Through the oral history interview process, we have attempted to capture the career stories and experiences of social studies practitioners. Oral history, a method of gathering primary source materials and preserving intimate experiences, perspectives, and knowledge of selected persons, has legitimacy (Nevins 1966 and Starr 1977). Our report is a result of reviewing the literature on social studies education and analyzing approximately

thirty oral history interviews with high school teachers, several whose careers began in the late 1940s and whose experiences in the classroom have enveloped the decades of the 1950s through the 1980s.

No offering of the high school curriculum is more central than social studies. Social Studies classes may afford high school students opportunities to understand and perhaps even criticize, the society in which they live. The high school classroom teacher as practitioner defines social studies and determines the criteria which measures effectiveness in the classroom. It is with these beliefs and assumptions that we have initiated a review of the literature and begun our oral history investigation of social studies teachers in the post World War II era.

Literature Review

Two of the most repeated themes in social studies literature have been the importance of the teacher as an individual who organizes, interprets, and evaluates students and the curriculum (e.g., Hertzberg 1981, pp. 158-59, 165; Evans 1990; Cornbleth 1985); and the discontinuities or "gulfs" (Mehlinger 1981, pp. 252-56) that separate the social studies as defined by university-based educators and the social studies as defined and practiced by elementary and secondary educators. Social Studies teachers clearly have lived in different cultures from their counterparts in universities; each of these cultures has had its own rewards and sanctions.

Hazel Hertzberg did a great service to the field by writing Social Studies Reform, 1880-1980; this work painted a clear picture of changes in the social studies as defined by leaders in the field. However, with several important exceptions (Hertzberg 1981,

pp. 109-12; Cuban 1984) little historical information has existed regarding the teaching of social studies in high school classrooms.

Before proceeding to gather data, we faced the dilemma of developing questions for the interview protocol. At the level of greatest abstraction, that is social, political, and attendant educational change, historians of education, particularly Hazel Hertzberg, David Tyack, and Joel Spring, provided valuable interpretations of education in the post World War II period. Our analysis of classroom actions of teachers, however, required the development of questions drawn from previous inquiries in social studies. This "Gordian Knot" had to be untied before we were able to develop our interview questions. Particularly germane to our study is the work of ethnographic researchers; these researchers have described the importance of interactions among administrators, teachers, and students as a basis for explaining and examining classroom phenomena. We believe that this line of inquiry has provided a rich source of data for the historical researcher using oral history inquiry techniques.

Historical Research

Historians of education (e.g., Spring 1989; Tyack and Hansot 1982) have identified the following important features on the landscape of post World War II history: the involvement of the federal government in funding curriculum projects and initiating legislation in response to Cold War conflicts and the Civil Rights movement, including the struggle for equality among ethnic groups, races, and sexes. Spring (1981) posited a forceful argument that this historical period in schooling is best understood as one in which the federal government played a major role in the identification and development of human resources, or "manpower sorting." Included

within a periodization which forms its boundaries on the Cold war, Spring identified the space race and the movement to rid schools of what was thought to be the anti-intellectual heritage of the "life adjustment" education movement of the 1940s as social currents that affected educational leaders and possibly social studies teachers. Similarly, he pointed out how the Civil Rights movement prompted curricular reforms which attempted to redress the issues and policies of racial inequality in American life.

Tyack's division of the progressive movement into four ideological camps--the administrative progressives, social reconstructionists, libertarians, and pedagogical progressives (Tyack 1974, pp. 196-97)--provided a valuable framework in which analysis of teachers' responses to questions of belief and practice were examined. The legacy of administrative progressives was the belief in an efficiently managed school where . . . "professional management would replace politics; science would replace religion and custom as sources of authority; and experts would adapt education to the transformed conditions of modern corporate life" (Tyack 1982, p. 107).

Pedagogical progressives, followers of John Dewey, were interested in the application of scientific principles to facilitate children's learning. Cuban (1984, p. 44) defines the following characteristics as associated with the practices of these individuals:

> For the most part pedagogical reformers wanted instruction and curriculum tailored to the children's interest; they wanted instruction to occur as often as possible individually, or in small groups; they wanted programs that permitted children more freedom and creativity than existed in schools; they wanted school experiences connected to activities outside of the classrooms; and they wanted children to shape the direction of their learning. The tangible signs of their impulses that bound philosophers, curriculum theorists, psychologists, and practitioners together were classrooms with movable furniture, provisioned with abundant instructional materials, active with children involved in projects, and traffic between the classroom and larger community.

Although libertarians and social reconstructionists have lacked a broad base of popularity among the citizenry and with secondary educators, their influence on the ideas of university-based social studies educators is well documented in works by Barr, Barth, and Shermis (e.g., Defining the Social Studies, The Nature of the Social Studies [1978]) and William Stanley (Review of the Research in Social Studies Education [1976-83, pp. 349-77]). Teachers, in varying degrees, were exposed to the ideas of libertarians and social reconstructionists in their undergraduate and graduate classes and in the pages of professional journals. The degree to which these ideas were incorporated into teacher beliefs and practices is problematic. Additionally, the period of the 1960s provided a social environment in which the ideas of social reconstruction permeated the popular press as well as professional journals. Although social reconstructionists never attained a broad base of popularity, we explored this topic in our interviews.

The beliefs which united educators into ideological camps were conceived in the atmosphere of social change of the early twentieth century; however, works by critics of public education such as Arthur Bestor and supporters of public education such as James Conant indicate that the ideas of administrative progressives, social reconstructionists, and pedagogical progressives continued to influence theory and practice in the post World War II period. Moreover, Hertzberg's conception of the "new social studies" movement was divided into two phases--one coinciding with the "new science and mathematics" movements and based on ideas of the structure of the discipline and inquiry; the second "social problems/self-realization," coinciding with the Vietnam protests of the 1960s and the Civil Rights movements (1981, 137-138). This division seems to repeat one of the themes which divided the progressives: the degree to which

content and methods of instruction are organized around academic disciplines, social problems, or the interests of students.

To summarize, the research literature indicated that political changes, such as those associated with the Cold War, space race, Vietnam War, and the Civil Rights movements, affected curriculum developers in universities. The degree to which political events affected the curriculum decisions of social studies teachers is more problematic. Little is known of the impact of these events on teachers.

In terms of ideological differences, the twentieth century has witnessed the division of social studies theorists into various camps. The division of social studies teachers into three or more "traditions" is a subject for continuing debate among theorists; the chasm which separates advocates of cultural transmission from proponents of social reconstruction is real. The degree to which teachers affiliated themselves with one ideological position, or changed positions over the course of their career, is a subject for our inquiry.

A Philosophy for Teaching Social Studies

Surprisingly few studies, theoretical or empirical, have considered the development of a teacher's philosophy of social studies. Articles concerned with the adoption of a particular rationale, global view, economic education, cultural literacy, etc. are fairly common in the literature; however, few studies have described the development of a rationale for teaching social studies by a secondary educator.

Newmann (1977, p. 1) clearly stated the importance of rationale building:

> What is wrong with civic education? Our troubles might be traced to any or all three kinds of failures: technical incompetence (not knowing how to teach what we want to teach), lack of consensus on goals (so many approaches and such disagreement over the proper aim of civic education

> that no clear purpose emerges), or inadequate rationales (assumptions underlying goals and methods which have not been clarified or justified--even to their proponents--in ways that provide thorough conceptual basis for civic education.

Conflicting conclusions have been described by ethnographic researchers regarding the development of rationales by social studies teachers. For example, Evans (1988, p. 223) reported that teacher's conceptions of history were clear and were the "major determinant of the transmitted curriculum, playing a significant role in content selection, emphasis, questions raised, and pedagogy employed." In this instance, Evans' study was focused on the perceptions of interns from a "prestigious" university. As a result of a follow-up study of experienced teachers (1990, pp. 126-27), Evans received a letter from one of the participants that the researcher described as the one teacher in the study who . . . "seems to produce sustained critical reflection in his students." The following is an excerpt from that letter:

> Thanks for the disturbing but accurate paper . . . Your accuracy is precisely what's disturbing about your work, because for the most part I have not thought about the issues you have dealt with. You are right, there is a philosophy underlying my teaching, but its the worst kind of philosophy, unexamined and unarticulated, even to myself.

The development of a rationale by the classroom teacher is problematic not in the sense of whether it is essential for good teaching; the consensus is that a rationale is vitally important for providing direction and consistency in teaching. The degree to which individual teachers possess articulated rationales and the affects of interactions among colleagues, students, parents and professors on an individual teacher's rationale are not answered by existing research.

Thus, we probed the range of possibilities of a rationale for teaching: Did teachers have a clear rationale when receiving their undergraduate degree and was the rationale maintained or modified in the course of their careers? Was the development of a rationale a neglected or emphasized aspect of their formal education?

School Context

Ethnographic researchers, particularly Linda McNeil, have demonstrated the importance of the school environment in shaping the ideas and practices of teachers. The concept of control and the contradictory demands that teachers both control and educate students proved important to our historical analysis. McNeil (1988, p. xx) summarized her previous study of high school teachers in the following manner:

> Feeling little support for their professional authority and even less provision for efficiencies of time and effort, the teachers set about to create their own authority, their own efficiencies. To do so they needed to control students, to both avoid discipline problems and even more to avoid inefficient exchanges which might alter the pace of the lesson or provide students with the opportunity to question the teacher's interpretation of history. Their solution was to control the knowledge, the course content, in order to control the students.

Hertzberg (1981, p. 158) described the student boredom that resulted from the textbook-based, teacher-dominated instruction which has characterized social studies instruction. Similarly, Goodlad's (1984, p. 210) survey indicated that high school students perceived social studies to be of lesser importance than English and mathematics and they believed the subject would be of little use in their future.

Clearly, the school milieu is more complex than the conception held by many of the new social studies change agents in the 1960s. Ethnographic findings raise the

possibility that the failure of new social studies curriculum projects was due to factors other than the inadequate resources devoted to the in-service education of teachers. Factors such as expectations of administrators, colleagues, students, parents, and members of the community may have been instrumental in shaping the beliefs and behaviors of social studies teachers.

Social Studies Content

Questions dealing with the content of social studies teaching were drawn from Hertzberg's history of the social studies. Many of the questions focused on the use of inquiry approaches, structure of the discipline to organize courses, and sources of information used by teachers in making decisions regarding the content chosen for instruction.

One area of content, the teaching of controversial issues, received considerable attention in our interviews. McNeil (1988, p. 73), Apple (1979, p. 87), Mehlinger (1981, p. 248), and Hertzberg (1981, p. 160) raised numerous questions regarding the role of controversial issues in the high school classroom. Were they discussed within a "zone of tolerance" defined by the local norms as posited by Mehlinger? Were controversial issues avoided as being inappropriate or perhaps too difficult for students to comprehend, or did teachers feel free to deal with these issues? Given the importance of controversial issues to university theorists, considerable effort was expended to gain the teacher's perspective on these issues.

The teaching of values received considerable attention in our interview protocol for reasons similar to those involving controversial issues. The recent history of the social studies has been punctuated by dramatic differences among professionals and the

public regarding the role values should play in the curriculum. Teachers who entered the classroom in the early 1950s may have inculcated values, taught a supposedly "value-free" social science approach, clarified values, and explored the implication of the hidden curriculum in the course of their careers. Fancett and Hawke (1982, p. 71) indicated that teachers are more likely to avoid value issues or to inculcate values. Goodlad (1984, p. 242) summarized his findings regarding student's involvement in value judgements as nonexistent. "Particularly lacking in our data," he assessed, "is anything to suggest the deliberate involvement of students in making moral judgements and in the understanding of the difference between these and decisions based upon scientific fact."

Given the importance of values to understand governmental policies and exercise judgments relative to controversial issues, it would appear essential and obligatory for teachers to engage their students in a rational analysis of values. Yet to assume this responsibility may put the teacher at risk of offending local community norms. It is also unsafe to assume that teachers were given adequate education in pedagogical skills necessary to teach values education models.

Teacher Methodology

The post World War II period witnessed the continuation of the twentieth-century struggle between theorists of varying ideologies who supported greater student involvement in the learning process with teachers who were often less than enthusiastic about the prospects of organizing student-centered classrooms. To what degree did social studies teachers adopt the inquiry teaching methods advocated by "new social studies" theorists? Did a majority, or even a minority, of teachers incorporate primary

sources, values clarification strategies, concept attainment strategies advocated by theorists? Did the teachers who adopted methods of the new social studies understand the theoretical assumptions of the teaching strategy?

Previous studies cast doubt on the ability of university theorists and change agents to alter the content and methods of instruction in high schools. The central focus of Cuban's (1984) history of teaching is the persistence of teacher-centered methods of instruction given the opposition to these methods by school critics. Cuban (1984, p. 251) concluded that "situationally-constrained choice" accounts for the predominance of teacher-centered methods. The numerous instructional, management, and human relations decisions militated against changes in pedagogy which were perceived by teachers as increasing the complexity of the classroom culture. McNeil (1984, pp. 158-62) proposed that teacher-centered teaching practices are used as a means to control students. She concluded that practitioners "teach 'defensively,' choosing methods of presentation and evaluation that they hope will create as little student resistance as possible."

A final series of questions focused on the use of psychology in creating lesson plans and units. Given the fact that our interviewees completed undergraduate, and in some cases graduate, psychology courses, to what degree did these courses influence teachers' instructional methods? Teachers who entered the profession in the 1950s were potentially exposed to the ideas of Jerome Bruner, Jean Piaget, B. F. Skinner, David Ausubel, and countless other behaviorists, cognitive psychologists, and developmentalists. With the exception of McNeil's (1984, p. 25) observation that high school teachers view students' ability as "static," few studies have explored teachers' use of psychological learning theory, or perceptions of the usefulness of psychology in their teaching.

Method of Data Collection

Over the last six months we conducted approximately thirty oral history interviews with high school social studies teachers from the states of Maine and Illinois. The interviewees, recruited from lists of propects supplied by educators in Maine and Illinois and by contacts through the respective state social studies councils, were volunteers. Each volunteer received a letter describing the purpose of the interview, and each interviewee signed a consent form providing for confidentiality and allowing use of comments in our in-progress report.

The interview process lasted from two to five hours. In most instances, one setting completed the interview. Several of the interview sessions, however, carried over from one day to another; in one case, the sessions for the interview were a week apart.

Most of the teachers interviewed had a master's degree or advanced certificate and had begun their teaching careers in the 1950s or early 1960s. Several had been nominated for or had received state teaching awards; a few had been offered fellowships when pursuing graduate degrees. Moreover, we interviewed teachers from both suburban and rural settings. Most of our interviewees were men; four interviewees were women. Nearly all had been at their high school since the 1960s.

Description

The teachers we interviewed entered the profession with high ideals and a desire to maintain the values and stability of the community in which they lived. The teachers

varied in academic achievement in high school and at the university level. Some expressed an inability to establish an identity in high school but found the university experience to be satisfying and rewarding. Others enjoyed a success in secondary education and continued their success at universities, several of which attended prestigious institutions of higher education. Moreover, career aspirations varied. Some recognized early in their college and university experience the desire to be a high school teacher. Others initially pursued goals such as medicine, engineering, or university instruction within a discipline but discovered an incongruency relative to their goals and their interests, abilities, and resources. Furthermore, there was no clear-cut relationship between the interviewees and the influence and abilities of their own high school instructors. Some had experienced high school instructors whom they regarded as excellent; others experienced teachers who lacked superior skills and abilities. More important to most interviewees was their relationship to university instructors, especially professors in an academic discipline.

The last forty years have witnessed both continuity and change in the teaching of social studies. The beliefs that the interviewees carried with them from their undergraduate education in the late 1940s and 1950s formed the assumptions they made about teaching. The area that was often times least elaborated by our interviewees was their philosophy of teaching social studies. While a philosophy of teaching social studies could include questions regarding the nature of society, the nature of knowledge, and the nature of the learner, our interviewees focused on subject matter and the need to control students and maintain their interests. When discussing their rationales, teachers were evasive in response to questions about their philosophy and, instead, redirected the discussion to their ability to maintain classroom control and to espouse their subject matter expertise. A typical response relative to a philosophy for teaching social studies

was, "I do not want my students to hate history. I want my students to have a good experience in history, and I want them to know that I know the subject. I want my students to know history and like it."

This set of beliefs, that is a retreat to knowledge of subject matter, was a common thread among the interviewees. Although there was a variation relative to the importance of teaching skills and socializing the students, the overwhelming majority of our interviewees saw as the core of the craft, discipline-based expertise. This vantage point and reliance upon subject matter served as an anchor and support system to brace against the winds of change in curricular reform. Curricular innovations such as the discipline-based high school geography project and Amherst History project as well as non-discipline-based reforms such as decision-making, values clarification, moral development strategies, and, most recently, cooperative learning, were evaluated by the criterion of adaptation to and an enhancing of the subject matter.

A vast majority of our teachers maintained their belief in the importance of discipline-based content and labelled threats to this organization as "fads." This is hardly surprising given the nature of the in-service education that these teachers received. In-service education consisted of episodic, disjointed presentations by "experts." Often these presentations were made to the faculty as a whole on topics of general interest or disinterest.

The most common characteristic of these programs described by our interviewees was that they "lasted less than one day and usually dealt with the current hot topic that caught the attention" of their administrator or curriculum director. The most graphic description of these programs was a contrast of in-service for a social studies teachers who also was a football coach. For football coaching he was sent to the University of Arkansas to work with and observe coaching strategies in order to improve

the football program at this high school. When it came time to incorporate inquiry strategies in history, the following sequence of events occurred. He was told to attend a department meeting about adoption of inquiry techniques. He attended and was opposed personally to adoption of the strategy. However, he was chosen by the department chair and an administrator to pilot inquiry techniques. Without any instruction on the technique and without any understanding of the reasons for the inquiry approach, he developed an idiosyncratic method of teaching inquiry for the next five years, whereupon the administration decided to abandon inquiry as part of the social studies curriculum. Reflecting on his experiences the teacher observed, "Just as I got good at it, they told me to quit!" Moreover, he lamented that the first three years may have been injurious to the students in his classes since he was experimenting with a method in which he had no background or training.

Another interviewee, an ABD in history, reacted to inquiry in the following manner. "It was big for a time. I never got involved in it. I could not figure out what to do with it, to tell you the truth. It was my perspective that they wanted to teach a concept before the students had any facts to support it." The interviewee had no in-service education in the inquiry approach nor concept development strategies. The lack of training led to a confusion regarding these techniques and knowledge of the methodologies was from "hearsay" and ephemeral.

The repertoire of teaching methods remained remarkably stable given the reform rhetoric of the 1950s through 1980s. If one were to accept the projects of the reformers, one would expect to see student-centered classrooms, multi-media instruction, inquiry within and across academic disciplines, as well as analysis of values and public policy issues. Instead, the teaching methods of the 1980's were remarkably similar to the teaching methods of the 1940s and 1950s. Teachers' conceptualization of

methodology was defined more as "style." The belief expressed time and again among interviewees was that style developed as a result of the interaction between teacher and students and that styles were idiosyncratic; what worked for one teacher and set of students might not work in another situation. Lectures continued to predominate as the methodology of social studies classes. Lectures provided a way for the teacher to prove he knew his subject. Teachers who adopted discovery or inquiry methods were considered innovative yet were held suspect. Those who engaged in inquiry were considered "lazy." As one interviewee observed, "They did not know their subject so they did not know the answers." From this interviewee's viewpoint, inquiry teachers, which were few in number, "had students find the answers because they did not know it themselves."

Interviewees saw no theoretical link for the selection of methods and content. Methods, from the perspective of our interviewees, were not taught. As one veteran of the social studies observed, "I was uncomfortable in staying behind the desk. The only way you could keep them [students] involved and maintain a high level of interest was to be in their midst. In order to maintain interest, you had to maintain eye contact. I don't think anyone ever taught me the techniques. I developed it [the methods] in order to be comfortable in the classroom. My colleagues developed their own styles."

The belief in idiosyncratic style combined with the paramount value of knowledge of subject matter and a teacher-centered classroom augmented use of new social studies projects; but the projects were used serendipitously. As one of our interviewees commented, "I saw them [projects] and scarfed them up. I had no idea how the author intended them to be used." The interviewee further stated, "I liked it [Amherst project] but I did not know how I found it, and I did not know how it was to be used. I used it as a

supplement to my course. It was a sheer accident that I found it. I did not get it from a college course, a colleague, or a conference."

In spite of claims of advocates in the social sciences and proponents of problem-solving strategies, history, primarily United States history, maintained its position as the backbone of the social studies curriculum. In fact, when asked to define their role in the school, a majority responded they were "history teachers." Most of our interviewees felt more prepared to teach history than other discipline in the social sciences. Teachers were serious about their responsibility to teach subject matter. Many of our interviewees were familiar with historiography in the discipline of history and had been initiated into social studies teaching through departments of history. The most fond recollections of their undergraduate and graduate experiences were in their academic discipline. These courses were described as rigorous, challenging, and rewarding. Subject matter expertise enabled them to be creative. Some of our interviewees spent hours developing courses that satisfied themselves as well as challenged their students. In a social and school environment with ambiguous messages, such as adopting new methods, globalizing the curriculum, teaching for relevancy, and clarifying values, history, for many of our interviewees, was assailed; yet, our interviewees did attempt to maintain and impart their own understanding of history as they learned it in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s.

Critics proposed alternative ways to teach history: use of primary sources, thematic organization, and controversial issues. Our interviewees persisted, however, in organizing their courses chronologically around a textbook. For example, controversial issues, which had been the hue and cry of reformers throughout the twentieth century, were avoided by teachers or sanitized through the dimensions of time and space. Many teachers felt they were not constrained in dealing with controversial

issues; yet they frequently avoided "hot topics" of a local nature. Teachers in Maine felt free to discuss Civil Rights issues as they pertained to the south but did not discuss issues involving labor and pollution within their surrounding community. When issues were dealt with, they were confined within a current events period where no written assignments went home. A trade-off was made between the opportunity for research and the security of the teacher.

The Vietnam period offered a major challenge to our interviewees. By the end of the 1960s the war in Vietnam divided the nation and was of interest to both teachers and students. Interviewees whose intellectual grounding in history reflected a liberal tradition found discussions of Vietnam difficult, for New Left writings attacked American involvement in Southeast Asia and challenged traditional interpretations relative to other periods of American history. Teachers holding a liberal tradition perspective felt obligated to explain and provide answers regarding the war; answers, they felt, were not easily defended to students who held a critical view of the American involvement in Vietnam. This identification with the war was even more personalized as teachers experienced the questioning and challenging by some students regarding not only American involvement beyond the nation's borders but the traditional authority and knowledge of teachers to choose content and to control students.

Since the end of World War II numerous events and movements have affected the nation. We expected to find the threat of atomic and nuclear weapons, the Korean War, and the atmosphere of the McCarthy era to have a great influence on teachers' lives in and out of the classroom. This was not the case. While many teachers acknowledged they had signed loyalty oaths through the 1960s, there were no major objections to this procedure. Moreover, judging from discussion of the literature during 1945 through 1950, one would expect teachers to be involved in educating students to live with atomic

reality. From our interviewees, this too was not the case. Similarly, the Korean War had little impact on these social studies teachers other than that their teaching career may have been interrupted by military service.

The Civil Rights movement, Sputnik, and the Vietnam war, however, cut right to the heart of the teacher's status. These social and political movements threatened the self-definition of teachers and the daily interactions with students which teachers value. Clearly, the materials of the new social studies offered an avenue to deal with controversial issues for these teachers. Public policy discussions and participation by students in local affairs would have provided an opportunity to channel student interests and frustrations. For a variety of reasons, teachers were unaware of these programs or were unwilling to abandon their traditional "styles" of teaching.

The interviewees accepted in principle the Civil Rights movement and the struggle for equality among races, ethnic groups, and sexes. Local manifestations of the Civil Rights movement, however, appeared disconcerting. Similarly the degree to which the interviewees embraced curricular changes varied, and in some cases, were discomforting. Sputnik elevated science and math but our interviewees felt their status as social studies teachers diminished. Math and science were supported as necessary to recapture our technological lead, whereas social studies was relegated to a position of less importance. Although federal and private funds did support new curriculum projects for social studies, these projects paled next to science and language laboratories. Having experienced the impact of Sputnik, many social studies teachers welcomed at first the increased enthusiasm for education. But our interviewees felt on the whole their field of study was left out and disregarded. "Science and math," remarked one disgruntled interviewee, "had all the toys." His remark was not an isolated view; for many shared the feeling that although social studies received some attention, it placed a

distant third behind the elegant disciplines of science and math. One interviewee felt the social studies lagged so far behind other disciplines of the high school curriculum in regard to respect that he claimed social studies was fifth behind science, math, English and foreign languages, and the vocational subjects.

The abstract purpose of citizenship and cultural understanding was not valued in the marketplace of ideas. The math and sciences that could help win the Cold War, the languages that could win the hearts and minds of people in developing countries, and the vocational education that could place people in the work force were valued as necessary to national security. Clearly, the perceptions of social studies teachers that their subject was held in such little esteem had an effect. Interviewees identified themselves with a particular discipline, such as history, economics, sociology or with an ancillary endeavor, such as coaching, when asked how they identified themselves regarding their position in the school system. Only one of the interviewees referred to himself as a social studies teacher. All others considered themselves as a historian, economist, sociologist, or coach. Identification as a social studies teacher met contempt. Social studies per se was regarded as an illegitimate and demeaning label. One way for our interviewees to maintain respect was to associate themselves with an academic discipline.

The legacy for students regarding the Civil Rights movement and the Vietnam War became an expression of demands. Students held a crude interpretation of the meaning "rights." A Rosseauean, romantic view existed that schools were illegitimate as they attempted to enforce requirements relative to the curriculum and standards of behavior. The Vietnam War compounded the alienation and cynicism of students as well as adults. Teachers were faced with a caucophony of demands and felt as though they were under seige. Courses had to be relevant. The individual reigned supreme as society and

institutions were to exist to serve the individual. One interviewee from a small town recalled, "Kids were in control. We were hanging on by our finger tips. There were drugs, and there was a questioning of authority, a negative spin-off of the Civil Rights movement, challenging the teacher's right to do anything. Children were determined to be rebellious. There was a swing away from relations [between teachers and students] that were needed. The 1970s were devastating and the pendulum has not swung back. We tried almost anything anyone would come up with. We rearranged the cafeteria, assigned big brothers. We rearranged schedules, we did away with homeroom. We made all kinds of changes." Another interviewee observed, "We grabbed at every straw and bill of goods. Everything I had worked for went down the tube. Everything was our [the teacher's] fault. That was the end of education."

Teachers found it difficult to separate the social studies reform efforts and materials from the mountain of multiple panaceas, each one better than the next, to solve problems of control and relevance in the classrooms. Solutions included mini-courses, counseling sessions, and values clarification. The seige mentality of teachers was reinforced as administrators recommended these generic solutions with little thought regarding the effect on the traditional curriculum valued by teachers. These changes, if implemented, displaced the traditional content and "style" teachers valued.

The insecurity of social studies teachers was not limited to one element of the political spectrum. In the 1970s New Right advocates attacked global education and argued there was a lack of patriotism and knowledge of United States history. Interviewees felt there was a need to protect themselves from accusations in the local media.

The major events affecting teachers of the social studies intruded on their ability to control and create lessons that were meaningful to their students and themselves.

Many resorted to avoidance of controversial topics and issues and adjusted by adapting lower standards. This adjustment, they felt, placated students who wanted success and recognition, in terms of grades, "even when they weren't." Still others adapted through team teaching or the buillding of stronger departments as a way to seek support. A small minority used new social studies methods and were acquainted with the rationale for these programs. They involved their students in local history projects and engaged them in participatory activities. These individuals gained credibility for themselves and their students in their communities.

Implications

We realize additional research must be completed before definitive statements can be made regarding a history of the social studies in the post World War II period. Particular interest is to see the degree to which urban teachers' perceptions of their teaching match those of their colleagues in suburban and rural districts. The history must be extended to include junior high (middle school) and elementary social studies teachers. These teachers faced different sets of demands, and comparisons will contribute to a more sophisticated analysis of the similarities and differences among practitioners.

A major point of our in-progress study is that teachers have a long history of not being easily swayed by "change agents." Veteran teachers have witnessed a long parade of proposed reforms; and therefore teachers are likely to perceive additional curricular changes as superficial fads. If change agents wish to succeed with practitioners, they must take the time to explain and work with teachers in developing a rationale for their

program; this rationale must be tied directly to the subject matter and the interests of the students that the teachers deem most important.

Our interviewees relied heavily upon the infusion of subject matter into the minds of students. Their conception of the menage a trois of teacher, subject matter, and students reflected attributes of administrative progressives. Certainly, our interviewees were cognizant of pedagogical progressive ideas, foremost of which was a student-centered classroom; but our interviewees, upon reflection of their teaching careers, believed it was necessary for a good teacher to control information and knowledge and to do so efficiently through teacher-centered activities. In part, this may be a result of our interviewees admiration for courses within their discipline and their disdain for courses in education. Our interviewees, moreover, gave little thought to psychological learning theory as they orchestrated the teaching-learning process in their social studies classrooms. The paucity of understanding and appreciating learning theory among our interviewees circumscribed the range of methodologies most frequently used in their classrooms.

This paper has summarized our preliminary study and established general patterns for further research. Our work will endeavor to establish specific differences among teachers during the post World War II era. With a larger sample, extending geographically beyond Maine and Illinois and expanding educationally beyond secondary schools, we expect more diverse traits and patterns among social studies teachers whose perspectives of what has transpired in social studies education needs to be recorded, analyzed, and expressed.

References

Apple, M. W. (1979). Ideology and Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Barr, R., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. S. (1978). The Nature of The Social Studies. Palm Springs, CA: ETC.

Bricker, D. C. (1989). Classroom Life as Civic Education Individual Achievement and Student Cooperation in Schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cornbleth, C. (1985). Reconsidering social studies curriculum. Theory and Research in Social Education, 13(2), 31-45.

Cuban, L. (1984). How Teachers Taught. New York: Longman.

Davis, O. L. (1981). Understanding the history of the social studies. In H. D. Mehlinger & O. L. Davis (Eds.), The Social Studies (pp. 19-35). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Engle, S. H., & Ochoa, A. S. (1988). Education for Democratic Citizenship Decision Making in the Social Studies. New York: Teachers College Press.

Evans, R. W. (1988). Lessons from history: Teacher and student conceptions of the meaning of history. Theory and Research in Social Education, 26 (3), 203-225.

Evans, R. W. (1990). Teacher conceptions of history revisited: Ideology, curriculum, and student belief. Theory and Research in Social Education, 18 (2), 101-138.

Fancett, V. S. & Hawfe, S. D. Instructional practices. In I. Morrisett (Ed.) Social Studies in the 1980s (pp. 61-78). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Giroux, H. A. (1988). Teachers As Intellectuals Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A Place Called School Prospects For The Future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodman, J. & Adler, S. (1985). Becoming an elementary social studies teacher. Theory and Research in Social Education, 13 (2), 1-20.

Hertzberg, H. W. (1981). Social Studies Reform 1880-1980. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jarolimek, J. (1981). The social studies: An overview. In H. D. Mehlinger & O. L. Davis (Eds.), The Social Studies (pp. 3-18). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). School-Teacher A Sociological Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

McNeil, L. M. (1988). Contradictions of Control School Structure and School Knowledge. New York: Routledge.

Mehlinger, H. D. Social studies: Some gulfs and priorities. In H. D. Mehlinger & O. L. Davis (Eds.), The Social Studies (pp. 244-269). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nevins, A. (1966). Oral history: How and why it was born. Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 40, (pp. 600-601).

Newmann, F. M. (1977). Building a rationale for civic education. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.) Building Rationales For Citizenship Education (pp. 1-33). Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies.

Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1982). Roger harker and shonhauser: From familiar to strange and back again. In G. Spindler (Ed.) Doing the Ethnography of Schooling Educational Anthropology in Action (pp. 21-46). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spring, J. (1989). The Sorting Machine Revisited National Educational Policy Since 1945. New York: Longman.

Stanley, W. B. (1985). Recent research in the foundations of social education: 1976-1983. In W. B. Stanley (Ed.) Review of Research in Social Studies Education 1976-1983 (pp. 309-399). Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Starr, L. (1977). Oral history Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences, Vol. 20, (pp. 440-463). New York: Marcel Dekker.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). The One Best System. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of Virtue. New York: Basic Books, Inc.